

And this shortfall is just for the active duty component. The Army Reserve recruited 82 percent of their May monthly goal, the Marine Corps Reserve just 88 percent of their monthly goal and the Navy Reserve brought aboard 94 percent of their monthly goal.

This is not a new trend. As of March 31st, four of the Reserve components were still falling significantly short of their recruiting objectives. In terms of year-to-date mission achieved, the Army Reserve, Army National Guard, Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve were all nearly 20 percent below the number needed to achieve their yearly goals. This information should be frightening to every Member of Congress. Not only is the shortfall affecting the active duty components, it is trickling down to our Guard and Reserve as well.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this speaks volumes. So what steps have been taken to increase recruiting for the services?

The Army wants to double the enlistment bonus for certain hard to fill jobs to \$40,000 (as reported by USA Today on June 10) and the Army Times reports that the "Army is proposing a pilot program to provide up to \$50,000 in home mortgage help for those who sign up for active duty." All this on top of having spent nearly \$200 million on positive and upbeat television ads and increased their recruiter pool by 1,000. Moreover, the Army National Guard has announced that they will add another 500 recruiters for a total plus-up of 1,900 (to 4,600) in 2005. The Army Reserve is adding 734 for a total of 1,774.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that simply increasing the number of military recruiters and throwing more and more money in the faces of our nation's high-school and college students is going to solve the recruiting shortfall.

No, we need to dig deep to understand the factors that are causing these shortfalls and address the situation there.

A Congressional Research Service report on this very issue notes that the United States has become embroiled in several major military operations overseas "that have dramatically increased the operations tempo of the military services. This has been especially true in the Army, which has shouldered the bulk of the manpower burden associated with the occupation of Iraq. Additionally, more military personnel have been killed or wounded in Iraq than in any other conflict since the Vietnam War. Many observers have expressed concern that the current operations tempo, and the level of casualties in Iraq, might lead to lower recruiting and retention rates, thereby jeopardizing the vitality of today's all volunteer military."

There cannot be any disagreement that the Global War on Terror (specifically operations in Iraq and Afghanistan) has taken its toll on military recruitment and retention. And I'm not sure that anyone over at the Department of Defense is listening.

I don't fault young men and women when they balk at joining the armed forces this year—be it active duty, guard or reserve. This is not what they had been led to believe would happen in Iraq.

Not when we have seen more than 1,700 Americans perish in Iraq since March of 2003. Not when 12,861 soldiers have been wounded in action.

Not when last month saw approximately 70 daily attacks by insurgents in Iraq.

Not when 67 percent of Active Duty Army troops have been deployed at least twice between 9/01 and 1/05.

Not when 30 percent of National Guard and 24 percent of Reserve troops were also deployed more than once in that same time-frame.

Not when we are sending troops to Iraq without the best armor, vehicles and equipment possible.

And not when this Administration routinely shortchanges the amount of money we should spend on Veterans in this nation all while mismanaging an unpopular war.

Mr. Speaker, our recruiting problems stem directly from the Administration's poor plan for Iraq. The young men and women in this great nation are not opposed to serving our nation in times of need. We know they are quite willing to sacrifice for the greater good. But I think it is undeniable that they do not believe protecting the oil pipelines by Iraq and unilaterally and preemptively attacking a nation that posed no strategic threat to the United States is a part of the greater good.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EFFECTS OF ACCUTANE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I come here tonight concerned about drug safety and to speak out to protect our children from the acne drug Accutane. As a legislator, I have called for more restrictions on the distribution and use of this drug, which is known to cause severe birth defects and a form of impulsive behavior and depression in patients taking this drug.

This drug has devastated my family with the loss of our son BJ and more than 268 other families who have lost their young son or daughter while he or she was taking Accutane.

News stories persist concerning the safety of our prescription drugs. When an FDA safety reviewer, Dr. David Graham, testified before the Senate Finance Committee this past winter, he stated, "I would argue that the FDA as currently configured is incapable of protecting America against another Vioxx." He went on to tell the Senate Finance Committee that "there are at least five other drugs on the market today that should be looked at seriously to see whether they should remain on the market." He cited the acne drug Accutane.

Why Accutane? Accutane is the poster child for why we need an independent body to approve and review drug safety. Accutane causes horrendous birth defects and may cause psychiatric disorders such as depression and suicide. It is linked to over 268 suicides, according to the FDA.

A recent study here by Dr. J. Douglas Bremner demonstrates how Accutane affects the brain, possibly causing impulsive behavior due to changes in the orbitofrontal cortex. This is the front part of the brain. This is an area known to cause or mediate depression.

As Dr. Bremner showed us in his study of the brain, there is a decrease in the metabolism of the brain. This chart here is of two PET scans of the same person's brain. The PET scan on your left establishes a baseline for the person before they took Accutane.

Now look at the second PET scan of the same person after 4 months on Accutane. Notice in the first scan before the Accutane the color red representing brain activity in the front part of the brain.

Now, on the second PET scan, the post-Accutane one, notice very little red, representing decreased brain activity in the same person after 4 months on Accutane therapy. Accutane decreases the metabolism in the front part of the brain, the area we know that mediates depression.

Dr. Bremner has concluded that this one patient here, there is a 21 percent decrease in brain metabolism in this patient. This change in the brain only occurred in Accutane patients.

Dr. Bremner performed PET scans on other non-Accutane patients who were taking a different oral antibiotic for acne. None of these patients experienced any brain changes.

Dr. Bremner also found that one-half of his Accutane patients in this study experienced a brain change, those who complained of severe headaches. Is it the excessive dosage found in the current formula of Accutane that is the cause of the change in the brain that we see in this PET scan?

The medical evidence is clear that Accutane causes changes in the brain, and this may be what leads some people to take their lives.

Let us join with Dr. Graham, the Centers for Disease Control, and other health care groups that have expressed strong concerns about the safety of this drug and who have called for Accutane to be withdrawn from the market as far back as 1990.

Let us pull Accutane from the market at least until we have all the answers surrounding this powerful drug. At the very least, the FDA should immediately require a large-scale review and study on the drug's effects on the brain.

Is this change of metabolism we see, that we see here, is it reversible? Will the brain repair itself? What amount or what dose of Accutane is safe? What amount or what dose of Accutane can be safely taken so the human brain is not affected? Has the FDA done enough to protect the American people, especially our young people, from the side effects of Accutane? Has the FDA seriously looked at Dr. Bremner's study and similar studies in animal testing, all of which demonstrate Accutane affects the brain?

It is time to protect our children. It is time to withdraw this drug, Accutane, from the market until all of our important safety questions are fully and completely answered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HIDDEN COSTS OF WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, this evening, I would like to address the subject of the hidden cost of war. The cost of war is always more than anticipated. If all the costs were known prior to beginning a war, fewer wars would be fought. At the beginning, optimism prevails; denial and deception override the concern for the pain and penalties yet to come. Jingoistic patriotism and misplaced militarism too easily silence those who are cautious about the unforeseen expenses and hardships brought on by war. Conveniently forgotten are the goals never achieved by armed conflict and the negative consequences that linger for years. Even some who recognize that the coming war will be costly easily rationalize that the cost will be worth it. Others claim it is unmanly or weak to pursue a negotiated settlement of a political dispute which helps drive the march toward armed conflict.

It has been argued by proponents of modern technological warfare in recent decades that sophisticated weapons greatly reduce the human cost by using a smaller number of troops equipped with smart weapons that minimize battle deaths and collateral damage. This belief has led some to be more willing to enter an armed conflict. The challenge will be deciding whether or not modern weapons actually make war more acceptable and less costly.

So far, the use of sanctions, the misjudgments of resistance to occupation, and unintended consequences reveal that fancy weapons do not guarantee fancy and painless outcomes. Some old-fashioned rules relating to armed conflicts cannot be easily repealed despite the optimism of the shock-and-awe crowd.

It seems that primitive explosive weapons can compete quite effectively with modern technology when the determination exists and guerilla tactics are used. The promised efficiency and the reduced casualties cannot yet be estimated.

Costs are measured differently depending on whether or not a war is de-

fensive or offensive in nature. Costs in each situation may be similar, but are tolerated quite differently. The determination of those defending their homeland frequently is underestimated, making it difficult to calculate cost.

□ 1815

Consider how long the Vietnamese fought and suffered before routing all foreign armies. For 85 years the Iraqis steadfastly have resisted all foreign occupation, and even their previous history indicates that meddling by Western and Christian outsiders in their country would not be tolerated.

Those who fight a defensive war see the costs of the conflict differently. Defenders have the goal of surviving and preserving their homeland, religious culture and their way of life, despite the shortcomings of their prior leaders. Foreigners are seen as a threat. This willingness to defend to the last is especially strong if the entity they fight for affords more stability than a war-torn country.

Hardships can be justified in a defensive war, and uses of resources is more easily justified than in an unpopular, far-away conflict. Motivations are stronger, especially when the cause seems to be truly just and the people are willing to sacrifice for the common goal of survival.

Defensive war provides a higher moral goal, and this idealism exceeds material concerns. In all wars, however, there are profiteers and special interests looking after their own selfish interests. Truly defensive wars never need a draft to recruit troops to fight. Large numbers voluntarily join to face the foreign threat. In a truly defensive war, huge costs in terms of money, lives and property are endured because so much is at stake; total loss of one's country the alternative.

The freer a country is, where the love of liberty is alive and well, the greater the resistance. A free society provides greater economic means to fight than a tyrannical society. For this reason, truly free societies are less likely to be attacked by tyrants, but societies that do not enjoy maximum freedom and economic prosperity still pool together to resist invaders.

A spirit of nationalism brings people together when attacked, as do extreme religious beliefs. The cause of liberty or divine emperor or radical Islam can inspire those willing to fight to the death to stop a foreign occupation. These motivations make the costs and risks necessary and justifiable, where a less popular offensive war will not be tolerated for long.

Idealism inspires a strong defense. Cynicism eventually curtails offensive wars. The costs of offensive war over time is viewed quite differently by the people who must pay. Offensive wars include those that are initiated by one country to seek some advantage over another without provocation. This includes needless intervention in the in-

ternal affairs of others and efforts at nation-building, even when well-intentioned.

Offensive war never achieves the high moral ground, in spite of proclamations made by the initiators of the hostilities. Offensive wars eventually fail, but, tragically, only after much pain and suffering. The cost is great and not well accepted by the people who suffer and have nothing to gain. The early calls for patriotism and false claims generate initial support, but the people eventually tire.

At the beginning of an offensive war, the people are supportive because of the justifications given by the government authorities who want the war for ulterior reasons, but the demands to sacrifice liberty at home to promote freedom and democracy abroad ring hollow after the costs and policy shortcomings become evident.

Initially, the positive propaganda easily overwhelms the pain of the small number who must fight and suffer injury. Offensive wars are fought without as much determination as defensive wars. They tend to be less efficient and more political, causing them to linger and drift into stalemate or worse.

In almost all wars, governments use deception about the enemy that needs to be vanquished to gain the support of the people. In our recent history, just since 1941, our government has entirely ignored the requirement that war be fought only after a formal congressional declaration, further setting the stage for disenchantment once the war progresses poorly.

Respect for the truth is easily sacrificed in order to rally the people for the war effort. Professional propagandists, by a coalition of the media and the coalition officials, beat the war drums. The people follow out of fear of being labeled unpatriotic and weak in the defense of our Nation, even when there is no national security threat at all.

Joining in support for the war are the special interest groups that have other agenda to pursue: profits, religious beliefs and partisan political obligations. Ideologues use war to pursue personal ambitions unrelated to national defense and convert the hesitant with promises of spreading democracy, freedom and prosperity. The tools they use are unrestrained state power to force their ideals on others, no matter how unjust it seems to the unfortunate recipients of the preemptive war.

For some, the more chaos, the greater the opportunity to jump in and remake a country or an entire region. At times in history, the opening salvo has been deliberately carried out by the ones anxious to get the war under way, while blaming the opposition for the incident. The deceptions must stir passion for the war through an appeal to patriotism, nationalism, machismo and jingoistic manliness of proving one's self in great feats of battle.

This early support before the first costs are felt is easily achieved. Since